

REMARKS

A. Introduction

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application. Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 2 and 4-11. Applicant's claim amendments are shown on the pages above following the heading AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS. On these pages, the deletions are ~~struckthrough~~ or [[double bracketed]] while the insertions are underlined.

Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, and Applicant earnestly requests such action. Below, Applicant addresses each of the Examiner's reasons for rejection.

B. All Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

Lineman et al. – §102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0065942 to Lineman et al. ("Lineman"). Applicant respectfully submits that these claims, as amended are allowable over Lineman.

An anticipation rejection under §102 requires that "every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference." *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990). "There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." *Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

As amended, independent claims 1 and 7 now recite an information security object (ISO) containing content characterized as object category, object descriptor, object content, content category and target group. These components of the ISO are described at paragraphs 17-23 of Applicant's published application (US 2005/0166259). Lineman does not teach or suggest an ISO containing content categorized as object category, object descriptor, object content, content category or target group. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 7 are allowable over Lineman. Dependent Claims 2-6, which include the features of independent Claim 1, and dependent Claim 8, which includes the features of independent Claim 7, recite additional features of particular advantage and utility. Moreover, these claims are allowable for substantially the same reasons presented above. Lineman does not teach or suggest

all of the limitations of Claim 1 or Claim 7, let alone the unique combinations of features recited by Claims 2-6 and 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

C. Lineman in view of Townsend

The Examiner rejected Claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lineman in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0188861 to Townsend. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable over Lineman in view of Townsend.

As amended, Claim 9 recites an information security object (ISO) containing an object category, an object descriptor, an object content, a content category and a target group. These components of the ISO are described at paragraphs 17-23 of Applicant's published application (US 2005/0166259). Neither Lineman nor Townsend, nor their combination, teaches or suggests an ISO containing an object category, an object descriptor, an object content, a content category, or a target group. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 9 is allowable over Lineman in view of Townsend. Dependent Claim 10, which includes the features of independent Claim 9, recites additional features of particular advantage and utility. Moreover, Claim 10 is allowable for substantially the same reasons presented above. Lineman in view of Townsend does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 9, let alone the unique combination of features recited by Claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

D. Townsend §102 Rejection

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Townsend. As discussed above, Townsend neither teaches nor suggests an ISO containing content categorized as object category, object descriptor, object content, content category or target group. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is allowable over Townsend.

Application Serial No.: 10/501,302
Amendment in Response to Office Action dated July 9, 2007
Amendment Date: March 7, 2008

CONCLUSION

For the reasons presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that this application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. If there is any further hindrance to allowance of the pending claims, Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1159.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 7, 2008



Howard J. Klein
Registration No. 28,727
Klein, O'Neill & Singh, LLP
43 Corporate Park Drive, Suite 204
Irvine, California 92606
Tel: (949) 955-1920
Fax: (949) 955 1921